

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY  
CAMDEN VICINAGE**

**IN RE: VALSARTAN, LOSARTAN,  
AND IRBESARTAN PRODUCTS  
LIABILITY LITIGATION**

**This Document Relates to All Actions**

MDL No. 2875

Honorable Robert B. Kugler,  
District Court Judge

**DEFENDANTS’ RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS’ NOTICE OF  
SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY [ECF NO. 2174]**

On October 13, 2022, Plaintiffs filed a putative Notice of Supplemental Authority in support of their pending motion for class certification. See [ECF No. 2174](#) (the “Notice”). Plaintiffs’ Notice attaches a September 19, 2022 decision in *In re Namenda Indirect Purchaser Antitrust Litigation*, No. 1:15-cv-6549, 2022 WL 4298767 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 19, 2022), in which the court declined to decertify a class of third-party payors in a “pay for delay” antitrust case. Plaintiffs assert that the *In re Namenda* court rejected arguments similar to those advanced by Defendants here, and appear to suggest that defense counsel recognized the relevance of this case based on certain statements by defense counsel at the recent October 6, 2022 Case Management Conference (“CMC”). But the recent decertification ruling (which dealt solely with the narrow question of damages) is inapposite; and Plaintiffs

mischaracterize defense counsel’s recent statements, which dealt with a different ruling in the *Namenda* litigation and a distinct set of discovery issues.

**A. The *Namenda* Decision Cited in Plaintiffs’ Notice Is Inapposite to the Class Certification Issues Raised in This Case.**

Plaintiffs first argue that *Namenda* supports the certifiability of an “aggregate” damages model. But the *Namenda* court merely reasoned that the TPP plaintiffs’ theory of damages there—*i.e.*, that reverse settlements to generic manufacturers delaying the market entry of generic memantine resulted in higher prices for the branded medication—was susceptible to classwide treatment because they were only trying *one* antitrust theory of liability, and as a result, there were “no multiple theories of recovery . . . to complicate the estimate of aggregate damages.” *In re Namenda Indirect Purchaser Antitrust Litig.*, No. 1:15-cv-6549, 2022 WL 4298767, at \*9 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 19, 2022). In so reasoning, the court reiterated that the Supreme Court in *Comcast* “indeed held that aggregate damages are *not* appropriate where the estimate represents the aggregate of multiple theories of liability.” *Id.* (emphasis added).

That principle forecloses class certification in this litigation because Plaintiffs *are* advancing multiple claims involving separate and distinct theories of damages recognized under the laws of the various states. *See* Defendants’ Economic Loss Class Certification Opposition, Appendix F (State Law Variations – Breach of Express Warranty [[ECF No. 2008-7](#)], Appendix G (State Law Variations – Breach

of Implied Warranty [[ECF No. 2008-8](#)]. As a result, a single class proceeding would devolve into a series of mini-trials as to the viability of a “worthlessness” theory of injury as to each class member, depending on the substantive state law that governs its claims.

Plaintiffs’ reliance on *Namenda* is all the more misplaced because the court’s original class certification decision in *Namenda* relied heavily on the uniformity of federal and state *antitrust* law. In particular, the court recognized that in the specific area of state antitrust law, where the states at issue adopted uniform state antitrust statutes that closely track the federal Sherman Antitrust Act, there were no meaningful state law variations to preclude certification. *In re Namenda Indirect Purchaser Antitrust Litig.*, 338 F.R.D. 527, 572 (S.D.N.Y. 2021) (“Most critically, even the states that have statutes that do not closely track the language of the Sherman Act have effectively harmonized their antitrust statutes with that of the federal law such that the elements needed to sustain a monopolization or restraint-of-trade claim – at the most basic level – are effectively the same under the state and federal laws.”). Here, by contrast, as detailed in Defendants’ class certification opposition briefs and accompanying appendices, Plaintiffs’ state law claims are rife with state law variations that preclude uniform treatment. *See* Defs’ EL Opp. Br., Appx. F, G, H, I, J [[ECF No. 2008-7](#), [-8](#), [-9](#), [-10](#), [-11](#)].

Finally, the ruling relied upon by Plaintiffs does not speak to the numerous other arguments set forth in Defendants’ prior briefing, not the least of which is that any class trial would be unmanageable given Plaintiffs’ proposal to try the TPP and consumer claims jointly in a complicated three-phase trial encompassing 114 subclasses, thousands upon thousands of pages of jury instructions, and a book-length “questionnaire” in place of a verdict form. *See* Defs.’ TPP Opp. Br. at 17 [[ECF No. 2010](#)]. No court or jury could possibly keep each subclass straight in a trial of such dizzying complexity. Nor could a TPP-specific trial be regarded as a superior option for adjudicating the TPP claims given that each TPP has likely paid for thousands, if not millions, of prescriptions. *Id.* at 19.

**B. Plaintiffs Mischaracterize Defense Counsel’s Arguments at the October 6 CMC.**

Plaintiffs also assert that the *Namenda* court’s decision on de-certification “directly contradicts Defendants’ argument at the last CMC here, at which they argued (incorrectly) that an earlier *Namenda* opinion suggested variations in state law preclude certification or present intractable choice-of-law issues for trial.” *See* [ECF No. 2174](#), p. 2. But defense counsel made no such argument. As reflected in the transcript of the October 6, 2022 CMC [[ECF No. 2172](#)],<sup>1</sup> defense counsel’s

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendants note that the final copy of the October 6th CMC transcript has not yet been publicly filed on the docket under the Court’s procedures. Defendants can provide a courtesy copy to the Court upon request.

discussion of *Namenda* was unrelated to class certification. Rather, defense counsel cited *Namenda* in the context of discussing why information about offsets and government reimbursements is discoverable with respect to an individual Medicare Advantage Organization's asserted damages. Because government benefits and reimbursements are not recoverable as damages, defense counsel argued that the discovery sought from Plaintiff MSP Recovery Claims Series, LLC, regarding its assignors' government payments, reimbursements, and offsets is relevant to damages. Defendants cited the recent ruling of the *Namenda* court on motions *in limine*, where the court specifically acknowledged the relevance of such information to a TPP's damages claim, as follows:

Any benefits, including discounts or subsidies, that flowed to a plaintiff must be used to reduce the amount of damages suffered by that plaintiff. Therefore, as a matter of law, to the extent [TPP] Class Members receive any form of payment that covers all of [sic] part of its memantine prescription costs, those payments must be deducted from damages. ***This is not even a close question*** - subsidies, of all forms, are a damages set off and the jury (assuming we have a jury trial on damages) will be so instructed.

*In re Namenda Indirect Purchaser Antitrust Litig.*, No. 1:15-cv-6549 (CM) (RWL), 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 149561, \*37 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 15, 2022) (emphasis added). In short, defense counsel was addressing a different ruling in the *Namenda* litigation, which concerned a separate issue unrelated to class certification.

Moreover, in the de-certification decision cited in Plaintiffs' Notice, the court reaffirmed that all applicable offsets to a Medicare Advantage Organization's

damages would be applied to any damage award at trial. *See In re Namenda*, 2022 WL 4298767, at \*9 (stating, “the court will instruct the jury that they cannot award aggregate damages in excess of the amount suffered by the class, which means net of all offsets.”). Consistent with defense counsel’s statements at the October 6 CMC, this further confirms the discoverability—and relevance—of this information with regard to the TPPs’ damages claim here.<sup>2</sup>

For all of these reasons, the *Namenda* antitrust class action litigation has no relevance to the propriety of class certification here.

Dated: October 20, 2022

By: /s/ Gregory E. Ostfeld  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
Lori G. Cohen, Esq.  
Victoria Davis Lockard  
Steven M. Harkins  
Terminus 200  
3333 Piedmont Rd., NE, Suite 2500  
Atlanta, Georgia 30305  
Tel: (678) 553-2385  
Fax: (678) 553-2386  
cohenl@gtlaw.com  
lockardv@gtlaw.com  
harkinss@gtlaw.com

Gregory E. Ostfeld  
Tiffany M. Andras  
77 West Wacker Drive, Suite 3100  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
Tel: (312) 456-8400  
ostfeldg@gtlaw.com

---

<sup>2</sup> Defendants further address the issue of relevance in the accompanying briefing requested by the Special Master on discovery issues in connection with the TPP trial.

andrast@gtlaw.com

Brian H. Rubenstein  
1717 Arch Street, Suite 400  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
Tel: (215) 988-7864  
rubensteinb@gtlaw.com  
*Attorneys for Teva Pharmaceuticals  
USA, Inc., Teva Pharmaceutical  
Industries Ltd., Actavis LLC, and Actavis  
Pharma, Inc.*

SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE,  
MEAGHER & FLOM LLP  
Jessica Davidson Miller  
Nina R. Rose  
1440 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 371-7000  
Facsimile: (202) 661-0525  
jessica.miller@skadden.com  
nina.rose@skadden.com  
*Attorneys for Zhejiang Huahai  
Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Huahai U.S.,  
Inc., Princeton Pharmaceutical Inc., and  
Solco Healthcare U.S., LLC*

PIETRAGALLO GORDON ALFANO  
BOSICK & RASPANTI, LLP  
Clem C. Trischler  
Jason M. Reefer  
Frank H. Stoy  
38th Floor, One Oxford Centre  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219  
Tel.: (412) 263-2000  
Fax: (412) 263-2001  
cct@pietragallos.com  
jmr@pietragallos.com  
fhs@pietragallos.com  
*Counsel for Mylan Laboratories, Ltd.*

*and Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

John P. Lavelle, Jr.

1701 Market Street

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Tel.: (215) 963-5000

Fax: (215) 963-5001

john.lavelle@morganlewis.com

John K. Gisleson

One Oxford Centre, Thirty-Second Floor

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Tel.: (412) 560-3300

Fax: (412) 560-7001

john.gisleson@morganlewis.com

*Attorneys for Aurobindo Pharma Ltd.,*

*Aurobindo Pharma USA, Inc., and*

*Aurolife Pharma LLC*

HILL WALLACK LLP

Eric I. Abraham

William P. Murtha

21 Roszel Road

P.O. Box 5226

Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5226

Tel.: (609) 734-6358

Fax: (609) 452-1888

eabraham@hillwallack.com

wmurtha@hillwallack.com

*Attorneys for Hetero Drugs, Ltd. and*

*Hetero Labs Ltd.*

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

Devora W. Allon

Alexia R. Brancato

601 Lexington Avenue

New York, New York 10022

Tel: (212) 446-5967

Fax: (212) 446-6460



Devora.allon@kirkland.com  
Alexia.brancato@kirkland.com  
*Attorneys for Torrent Pharmaceuticals  
Ltd. and Torrent Pharma Inc.*

HARDIN KUNDLA MCKEON &  
POLETTO

Janet L. Poletto, Esq.  
Robert E. Blanton, Jr., Esq.  
673 Morris Ave.  
Springfield, New Jersey 07081  
Tel.: (973) 912-5222  
Fax: (973) 912-9212  
jpoletto@hkmpp.com  
rblanton@hkmpp.com  
*Attorneys for Hetero USA Inc.*

CROWELL & MORING

Andrew D. Kaplan  
Daniel T. Campbell  
Marie S. Dennis  
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel.: (202) 624-1000  
Fax: (202) 628-5116  
akaplan@crowell.com  
dcampbell@crowell.com  
mdennis@crowell.com  
*Attorneys for Cardinal Health, Inc.*

ULMER & BERNE LLP

Jeffrey D. Geoppinger  
312 Walnut Street, Suite 1400  
Cincinnati, OH 45202-2409  
Tel.: (513) 698-5038  
Fax: (513) 698-5039  
jgeoppinger@ulmer.com  
*Attorneys for AmerisourceBergen  
Corporation*

NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP

D'Lesli M. Davis

Ellie K. Norris

2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 3600

Dallas, TX 75201-7932

Tel.: (214) 855-8221

Fax: (214) 855-8200

Dlesli.davis@nortonrosefulbright.com

Ellie.norris@nortonrosefulbright.com

*Attorneys for McKesson Corporation*

BARNES & THORNBURG LLP

Sarah E. Johnston *Liaison Counsel for  
the Retail Pharmacy Defendants*

Kristen L. Richer

2029 Century Park East

Suite 300

Los Angeles, California 90067

Tel.: (310) 284-3880

Fax: (310) 284-3894

sarah.johnston@btlaw.com

kristen.richer@btlaw.com

Kara Kapke

11 S Meridian St.

Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Tel. (317) 236-1313

Fax (317) 231-7433

kara.kapke@btlaw.com

*Attorneys for CVS Pharmacy, Inc.,  
(incorrectly named as CVS Health  
Corporation), Rite Aid Corporation,  
Walgreen Co. (incorrectly named as  
Walgreens Co.), and Walmart Inc.  
(incorrectly named as Walmart Stores,  
Inc.)*

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL &

ROONEY PC

Jonathan D. Janow  
Jason R. Parish  
1700 K Street NW  
Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20006  
Tel.: (202) 452-7940  
Fax: (202) 452-7989  
[Jonathan.Janow@bipc.com](mailto:Jonathan.Janow@bipc.com)  
[Jason.Parish@bipc.com](mailto:Jason.Parish@bipc.com)  
*Attorneys for Albertson's LLC*

HUSCH BLACKWELL LLP  
Matt Knepper  
James Spung  
190 Carondelet Plaza  
Suite 600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63105  
Tel.: (314) 480-1500  
Fax: (314) 480-1505  
[Matt.knepper@huschblackwell.com](mailto:Matt.knepper@huschblackwell.com)  
[James.spung@huschblackwell.com](mailto:James.spung@huschblackwell.com)  
*Attorneys for Express Scripts, Inc.*

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD &  
SMITH LLP  
Andrew F. Albero  
Walter H. Swayze III  
550 E. Swedesford Rd., Suite 270  
Wayne, PA 19087  
Tel.: (215) 977-4058  
Fax: (215) 977-4101  
[Andrew.albero@lewisbrisbois.com](mailto:Andrew.albero@lewisbrisbois.com)  
[Pete.swayze@lewisbrisbois.com](mailto:Pete.swayze@lewisbrisbois.com)  
*Attorneys for Camber Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on October 20, 2022, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system which will send a notice of electronic filing to all CM/ECF participants in this matter.

/s/ Gregory E. Ostfeld  
Gregory E. Ostfeld